UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,677	12/27/1999	MARK D. SMITH	EN999071	9073

7590 12/18/2003

SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND P C
ATTORNEY AT LAW
314 MAIN STREET
OWEGO, NY 13827

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, CHAU T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/472,677	SMITH, MARK D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 September 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment A, received on 09/29/2003, has been entered. Claims 1, and 3-11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-5 and 9-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. Patent No. 6,199,098 and further in view of Junkin, Patent No. 6,493,717.

Regarding **independent claim** 1, Jones et al. teaches organizing a site as a list of topical content areas in a content database, each said area containing a list of content items that a user can link to for display using views; and providing a site view as a category oriented view. (Jones et al., Fig. 1E.)

providing a site navigation view (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 9-10.)

Further, Jones et al. teach responsive to a user request for display of the site view, executing an agent to access said site navigation view to obtain and display to the user the latest content. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 51-57: "Utilizing structure definition file 190 and portions of HTTP request 140, script program 180 dynamically generates HTML Web page 145 specifying a hierarchical TOC display reflecting the currently desired display state. Script program 180 can then cause server software 160 to transmit a copy of Web page 145 back to client computer 100 and browser program 120, for display on monitor 110.").

However, Jones does not explicitly teaches providing a site navigation view as an index on said content database, said index being dynamically updated whenever additions and deletions of area category or content items are made to said content database; and executing an agent to access said site navigation view to obtain and display to said user current area category and items from said content database.

In the similar field of endeavor, Junkin teaches a DataCrawler system includes an interface being capable of utilizing relational/linked data, separate administration and en-user access, easily configurable access to database views, full editing (insert, updating, and delete) capabilities (Abstract, and col. 4, lines 20-28). Junkin also discloses the DataCrawler system incorporates a reusable Universal Data Access Graphical User Interface for navigating and editing database information (col. 4, line 29 – col. 5, line 29 and Figs. 2, 3, and 4), and when a Web server receives a request from a Web browser, the information my be an up-to-date stock quote is sent to the Web

browser (col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 2). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jones and Junkin to include providing a site navigation view as an index on said content database, said index being dynamically updated whenever additions and deletions of area category or content items are made to said content database; and executing an agent to access said site navigation view to obtain and display to said user current area category and items from said content database. Junkin suggests that by providing a universal methodology for exploring and editing database information, the system combines the flexibility to administer customized interrelated database storage with the low maintenance overhead of a structured, pre-built interface.

Regarding **independent claim 3**, the rejection of claim 1 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 4**, Jones et al. and Junkin teach their invention in the context of "a client-server network environment like the Web" that inherently would have contained the recited program storage device.

Further, the rejection of claim 1 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 5**, Jones et al. teach a content database for storing a plurality of documents inasmuch as the retrieval of network documents taught

by Jones et al. inherently would have required a content database for storing a plurality of documents. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 34-43.)

Further, Jones et al. teach a site view layout structure and a site navigation view in as much as they teach a hierarchical display of a table of contents. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 9-10.)

Further, Jones et al. teach a user browser. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 34-35.)

Further, Jones et al. teach a create map agent for accessing the site navigation view to identify documents in the content database and extract to the site view layout structure data for presentations in the fields of the site view. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 43-57: "In addition, in accordance with the present invention, server computer 150 uses script program 180 to process requests involving an expandable table of contents. Script program 180 in turn references structure definition file 190, which defines the overall hierarchical structure of a given TOC; script 180 also references portions of the address path making up HTTP request 140, to extract information about the current display state of the TOC. Utilizing structure definition file 190 and portions of HTTP request 140, script program 180 dynamically generates HTML Web page 145 specifying a hierarchical TOC display reflecting the currently desired display state. Script program 180 can then cause server software 160 to transmit a copy of Web page 145 back to client computer 100 and browser program 120, for display on monitor 110.")

However, Jones et al. do not explicitly teach a site navigation view for indexing area category and content items in said content database, said index being updated

whenever additions and deletions of area category and content items are made to said content database.

In the similar field of endeavor, Junkin teaches a DataCrawler system includes an interface being capable of utilizing relational/linked data, separate administration and en-user access, easily configurable access to database views, full editing (insert, updating, and delete) capabilities (Abstract, and col. 4, lines 20-28). Junkin also discloses the DataCrawler system incorporates a reusable Universal Data Access Graphical User Interface for navigating and editing database information (col. 4, line 29 – col. 5, line 29 and Figs. 2, 3, and 4). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jones and Junkin to include a site navigation view for indexing area category and content items in said content database, said index being updated whenever additions and deletions of area category and content items are made to said content database. Junkin suggests that by providing a universal methodology for exploring and editing database information, the system combines the flexibility to administer customized interrelated database storage with the low maintenance overhead of a structured, pre-built interface.

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Jones et al. teach responsive to a user request for a display of the site view, setting up a site view layout structure. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 51-55: "Utilizing structure definition file 190 and portions of HTTP request 140,

script program 180 dynamically generates HTML Web page 145 specifying a hierarchical TOC display reflecting the currently desired display state.")

Further, Jones et al. teach identifying in a navigation view one or more navigation documents. (Jones et al., col. 8, lines 44-47: "At step 465, hypertextual information is determined for the current node. If the node is a leaf node and its entry in structure definition file 190 includes an explicit URL, then that URL is encoded as a hypertext link for that node's entry in the Web page.")

Further, Jones et al. teach for each navigation document identified, determining the category name and adding a list item for said category to the site view layout structure inasmuch as Jones et al. teach documents added to a table of contents in the categories to which they belong. (Jones et al., col. 7, lines 32-52.)

Further, Jones et al. teach copying each list item from the layout structure to the site view for display responsive to the user request. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 55-58: "Script program 180 can then cause server software 160 to transmit a copy of Web page 145 back to client computer 100 and browser program 120, for display on monitor 110.")

However, Jones et al. do not explicitly teach a site navigation view for indexing area category and content items in said content database, said index being updated whenever additions and deletions of area category and content items are made to said content database.

In the similar field of endeavor, Junkin teaches a DataCrawler system includes an interface being capable of utilizing relational/linked data, separate administration and

en-user access, easily configurable access to database views, full editing (insert, updating, and delete) capabilities (Abstract, and col. 4, lines 20-28). Junkin also discloses the DataCrawler system incorporates a reusable Universal Data Access Graphical User Interface for navigating and editing database information (col. 4, line 29 – col. 5, line 29 and Figs. 2, 3, and 4). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jones and Junkin to include a site navigation view for indexing area category and content items in said content database, said index being updated whenever additions and deletions of area category and content items are made to said content database. Junkin suggests that by providing a universal methodology for exploring and editing database information, the system combines the flexibility to administer customized interrelated database storage with the low maintenance overhead of a structured, pre-built interface.

Regarding **independent claim 10**, Jones et al. and Junkin teach the recited computer readable medium with computer readable program code means inasmuch as the recited computer readable medium with computer readable program code means would have been found on the server computer taught by Jones et al. (Jones et al., Fig, 2, block 150.)

Further, the rejection of claim 1 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 11**, Jones et al. and Junkin teach the recited computer program product or computer program element. (Jones et al., Fig, 2, block 150.)

Further, the rejection of claim 1 above is fully incorporated herein.

4. **Claims 6-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. and Junkin as discussed in claims 1, 3-5 and 9-11in view of Kerry A. Lehto et al., *Introducing Microsoft FrontPage97* (Microsoft Press: 1997), pages 144-158.

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, Jones et al. teach the site view including a site map and a table of contents as discussed above regarding claim 2.

Further, Jones et al. teach display of site maps and tables of contents using HTML (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 51-57), but do not explicitly teach the respective use of HTML tables and lists. However, Lehto et al. teach on page 147 that HTML tables provide the benefit of allowing web sites to present information in an ordered way, and to preserve the same appearance of data that will appear on multiple pages. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a site map contained data that would benefit from being ordered in a table and having its appearance standardized. Also, Lehto et al. teach on page 144 that lists make data easier to read and are a user-friendly form of presentation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a table of contents is a structure frequently presented in list form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use HTML tables and lists for site maps and tables of contents respectively.

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Jones et al. do not teach a site map form for providing a tabular layout structure for the site map and a table of contents form for providing a column layout structure for the table of contents. However, the script program for generating the site map and table of contents taught by Jones et al. (Jones et al., col. 5, lines 51-55) inherently would have contained forms for the site map and table of contents because otherwise the script program would not have been able to generate the display of those items. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the use of such forms would have been efficient and relieved the web site programmer of the need to repeatedly create HTML for containing the site map and table of contents. Therefore, in view of the obviousness of using HTML tables and lists (note that lists are inherently columnar) discussed above regarding claim 6 it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement a site map form for providing a tabular layout structure for the site map and a table of contents form for providing a column layout structure for the table of contents.

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Jones et al. do not explicitly teach the site map form and the table of contents form providing respective data fields for receiving data from the create map agent dynamically responsive to a request from a user for display of the site map or table of contents. However, inasmuch as the site map and table of contents forms would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as discussed above regarding claim 7, it would have been inherent to provide respective data fields

for receiving data from the create map agent because otherwise the information that the user had requested to be displayed could not have been displayed, *i.e.,* data returned from a server would have had to have been placed in fields in order to be displayed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 09/29/2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., providing a site navigation view as an index on said content database, said index being dynamically updated whenever additions and deletions of area category or content items are made to said content database) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The examiner can normally be reached at 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3230.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20131

Or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for **formal communications**; please mark "EXPEDITE PROCEDURE").

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for **informal or draft communications**, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Or:

(703) 872-9306 (for **After Final Communications**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER